



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/604,807	08/19/2003	Daniel Jon Themig	45023-11	1806
23971	7590	06/28/2005	EXAMINER	
BENNETT JONES C/O MS ROSEANN CALDWELL 4500 BANKERS HALL EAST 855 - 2ND STREET, SW CALGARY, AB T2P 4K7 CANADA			WALKER, ZAKIYA NICOLE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3676	
			DATE MAILED: 06/28/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/604,807

Applicant(s)

THEMIG ET AL.

Examiner

Zakiya N. Walker

Art Unit

3676

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 01282004.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the term "are disclosed" is stated in line 1. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).
2. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-4, 7-10, 12, and 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sanford.

Sanford discloses an apparatus that includes an apparatus for fluid treatment of a borehole, the apparatus comprising a tubing string having a long axis and a wall defining an inner bore, a plurality of closures 44 accessible from the inner bore of the tubing string, each closure closing a port 48 extending through the wall of the tubing string and but being openable and each closure openable preventing fluid flow through its port, to permit fluid flow through its port independently from each other closure and a port-opening sleeve 58 positioned in the tubing string and driveable through the tubing string to actuate the plurality of closures to open the ports. With respect to depending claims 2-10, the reference teaches the limitations as claimed, including at least one of the closures including a shearable cap 44, a sealing device (ball 28, plug), a seat (upper 58), and a packer 78. With respect to method claims 15-20, the reference teaches the limitations as claimed.

5. Claims 1-10 and 12-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Szarka.

Szarka discloses an apparatus that includes an apparatus for fluid treatment of a borehole, the apparatus comprising a tubing string having a long axis and a wall defining an inner bore, a plurality of closures 18 accessible from the inner bore of the tubing string, each closure closing a port 34 extending through the wall of the tubing string and but being openable and each closure openable preventing fluid flow through its port, to permit fluid flow through its port independently from each other closure and a port-opening sleeve (135, 174) positioned in the tubing string and driveable through the tubing string to actuate the plurality of closures to open the ports.

Art Unit: 3676

With respect to depending claims 2-10, the reference teaches the limitations as claimed, including at least one of the closures including a shearable cap, at least one of the closures including a port-closure sleeve (135,174), a profile and locking dog 82, a sealing device (ball/plug 200), a seat (79, 33), and a multiple element packer (70= 50, 54, 56, 66, 68). With respect to method claims 15-21, the reference teaches the limitations as claimed.

Double Patenting

6. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

7. Claims 1-15 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 5-7, 9, 10, and 12 of U.S. Patent No. 6,907,936. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of the instant invention are merely a broadened form of the US'936 patent claims. Therefore, it would have been considered obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made

to have included the claims of the present invention within the earlier-filed US'936 patent in order to obtain broader patent coverage.


Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Allamon et al., Vanni, and Hutchison et al. teach apparatuses having port-opening sleeves actuated by shearing pins to move the sleeve to uncover ports to allow circulation.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Zakiya N. Walker whose telephone number is (571) 272-7039. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:30 AM-5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Glessner can be reached on (571) 272-6843. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Zakiya N. Walker
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3676

ZW
June 22, 2005